

## **REMARKS/ARGUMENTS**

### **Description of Amendments**

In this Amendment, Applicant amends claims 1, 26, 48, 50, 52, 54, and 56; cancels claims 2, 9-11, 15, 24, 27, 49, 58, 59, and 61-108; and rewrites claims 23 and 60 in independent form. As amended, claims 1, 3, 4, 6, 7, 20-23, 26, 28-48, 50-57 and 60 are pending.

No new matter is introduced by this Amendment.

### **Objection to Claims**

Claim 23 is objected to because it depends from canceled claim 5. Examiner Rampuria suggests that Applicant amend claim 23 to depend from claim 1. Applicant appreciates Examiner Rampuria's suggestion and has amended claim 23 accordingly.

### **Rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 102**

Claims 1, 3-4, 6, 7, 9-11, 15, 20-22, 24, 26, 28-47, 49-59, 61-93 and 104-107 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by *Nickum* (U.S. Patent Publication 20010039195). The cancellation of claims 9-11, 15, 24, 49, 58, 59, 61-93, and 104-107 renders their rejection moot. For the following reasons, Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection of claims 1, 3-4, 6, 7, 20-22, 26, 28-47, and 50-57.

Each of independent claims 1 and 26 recites that when the PDA and the cell phone are coupled, the cell phone and the PDA are capable of being used independently and simultaneously to perform their respective functions. *Nickum* does not disclose this feature. *Nickum* discloses that a portable computer, a cell phone and a pager can be connected in terms of power sources and communications, and the three devices work together when they are connected. However, *Nickum* does not disclose that when the three devices are connected, they can independently and simultaneously to perform their respective functions. In other words, *Nickum* does not disclose that when they are connected, the portable computer can perform its functions; the cell phone can make and receive calls; and the pager can send and receive pages. Whenever *Nickum* mentions "stand alone operation," it states

that the devices are disconnected, or that the power supplies (not the devices themselves) can operate separately.

Paragraph [0030] of *Nickum* states:

[0030] When the communication apparatus 10 is fully combined in connected mode, with all components, portable computer 12, cellular telephone 14, and pager 16, various functions and capabilities of the individual components may be used to complement functions of the remaining components. For example, pager 16 and/or telephone 14 could be used to control certain computer functions such as alert, power on, power off, and the like.

This paragraph does not state that the three devices can independently and simultaneously perform their respective functions. On the contrary, the paragraph states that the three devices, when connected, work together. In other words, this paragraph teaches away from Applicant's invention as defined by claim 1 or 26.

Accordingly, for at least the reasons stated above, claims 1 and 26 are not anticipated by *Nickum*.

Each of independent claims 50, 52, 54, and 56 (as well each of dependent claims 29, 33, and 35) recites that the processing device is usable to place and receive a telephone call via the wireless communication device. This feature is not disclosed or taught by *Nickum*.

Paragraph [0030] of *Nickum* states:

[0032] It will be readily seen that the interconnection between portable computer 12, cellular telephone 14, and pager 16 allow communication apparatus 10 to function as a total communications package, allowing connection to a network or the internet, allowing outgoing and incoming telephone transmissions, allowing the receipt of pages, allowing the transmission and receipt of facsimile messages with appropriate software for portable computer 12, and the like. The communication apparatus 10 is versatile enough to allow disconnection of one or more of its components for stand alone use. For example, if the user of the communication apparatus 10 wished to leave the location at which the user was, but did not wish to carry or transport the entire communication apparatus 10, the user could choose which components of the apparatus 10 he wished to carry. For a short absence, pager 16 may be the only component the user wishes to take. For certain instances, only the cellular telephone 14 may be desired. It is a simple matter to disconnect the individual component desired from the communication apparatus as a whole. In this way, the total communication apparatus 10 becomes even more versatile for everyday use.

However, this paragraph does not disclose or teach that the portable computer can be used to make or receive telephone calls via the cell phone. Instead, the paragraph merely mentions that the communication apparatus 10 as a whole can make outgoing and incoming telephone calls.

Accordingly, for at least the above reasons, independent claims 50, 52, 54, and 56 are not anticipated by *Nickum*.

Additionally, Applicant's careful review of paragraph [0030] of *Nickum* does not show that this paragraph discloses the features of claims 30-32. Paragraph [0030] says nothing that can be remotely interpreted as disclosing: (1) the portable computer displays information related to the cell phone; (2) the portable computer displays information normally provided on a mobile phone display; or (3) the portable computer displays a remaining battery charge of the cell phone and a reception strength of the cell phone.

The other dependent claims not specifically mentioned above all depend from the independent claims and therefore are not anticipated by *Nickum* for the same reasons that the independent claims are not anticipated.

Claims 94-103 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by *Wendling* (U.S. Patent 6,701,161). The cancellation of claims 94-103 renders this rejection moot.

#### Rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 103

Claims 2, 27, 45, 108 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over *Nickum* in view of *Boesen*, United States Patent Application Publication 20010027121 ("Boesen"). The cancellation of claims 2, 27, and 108 renders this rejection moot. The rejection of claim 45 relies on the rejection of claim 26. Since as stated above the rejection of claim 26 is improper, the rejection of claim 45 is also improper.

#### Claim 60

Applicant respectfully submits that claim 60 is patentable because it is not mentioned in any of the rejections.

Application No. 10/804,857  
Amendment dated February 17, 2009  
Reply to Office action of August 14, 2008

Conclusion

In light of the foregoing remarks, this application is considered to be in condition for allowance, and early passage of this case to issue is respectfully requested. If necessary to effect a timely response, this paper should be considered as a petition for an Extension of Time sufficient to effect a timely response, and please charge any necessary fees and deficiency in fees or credit any overpayments to Deposit Account No. 07-1850.

Respectfully submitted,

Date: February 17, 2009

---

Squire, Sanders & Dempsey L.L.P.  
One Maritime Plaza  
Suite 300  
San Francisco, CA 94111  
Facsimile (415) 393-9887  
Telephone (415) 954-0241  
[szhu@ssd.com](mailto:szhu@ssd.com)

/Song Zhu, Reg. No. 44,420/

---

Song Zhu, Ph.D.  
Attorney for Applicant  
Reg. No. 44,420